

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/766,015

Applicant(s)

KANO ET AL.

Examiner

ALI NEYZARI

Art Unit

2656

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) ALI NEYZARI.

(3) HIROSHI KAWANO

(2) Carl Brundidge.

(4) MASAKI KAWAGUCHI

Date of Interview: 26 October 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: Rejected claims

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _____.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

We compared the claim it appears that there are patentable differences which could overcome the rejection. Examiner will give further consideration.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required